UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 2231-1450
www.uspto.gov

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND FEE(S) DUE

5073   7590   03/19/2008

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2008

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,726	10/15/2003	Craig H. Rowland	062891.1166	5392

TITLE OF INVENTION: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR REDUCING THE FALSE ALARM RATE OF NETWORK INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEMS

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	NO	$1440	$300	$0	$1740	06/19/2008

THE APPLICATION IDENTIFIED ABOVE HAS BEEN EXAMINED AND IS ALLOWED FOR ISSUANCE AS A PATENT. PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS CLOSED. THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE AT THE INITIATIVE OF THE OFFICE OR UPON PETITION BY THE APPLICANT. SEE 37 CFR 1.313 AND MPEP 1308.

THE ISSUE FEE AND PUBLICATION FEE (IF REQUIRED) MUST BE PAID WITHIN **THREE MONTHS** FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE OR THIS APPLICATION SHALL BE REGARDED AS ABANDONED. **THIS STATUTORY PERIOD CANNOT BE EXTENDED.** SEE 35 U.S.C. 151. THE ISSUE FEE DUE INDICATED ABOVE DOES NOT REFLECT A CREDIT FOR ANY PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE IN THIS APPLICATION. IF AN ISSUE FEE HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN PAID IN THIS APPLICATION (AS SHOWN ABOVE), THE RETURN OF PART B OF THIS FORM WILL BE CONSIDERED A REQUEST TO REAPPLY THE PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE TOWARD THE ISSUE FEE NOW DUE.

HOW TO REPLY TO THIS NOTICE:

I. Review the SMALL ENTITY status shown above.

If the SMALL ENTITY is shown as YES, verify your current SMALL ENTITY status:

A. If the status is the same, pay the TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown above.

B. If the status above is to be removed, check box 5b on Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal and pay the PUBLICATION FEE (if required) and twice the amount of the ISSUE FEE shown above, or

If the SMALL ENTITY is shown as NO:

A. Pay TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown above, or

B. If applicant claimed SMALL ENTITY status before, or is now claiming SMALL ENTITY status, check box 5a on Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal and pay the PUBLICATION FEE (if required) and 1/2 the ISSUE FEE shown above.

II. PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL, or its equivalent, must be completed and returned to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) with your ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). If you are charging the fee(s) to your deposit account, section "4b" of Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal should be completed and an extra copy of the form should be submitted. If an equivalent of Part B is filed, a request to reapply a previously paid issue fee must be clearly made, and delays in processing may occur due to the difficulty in recognizing the paper as an equivalent of Part B.

III. All communications regarding this application must give the application number. Please direct all communications prior to issuance to Mail Stop ISSUE FEE unless advised to the contrary.

IMPORTANT REMINDER: Utility patents issuing on applications filed on or after Dec. 12, 1980 may require payment of maintenance fees. It is patentee's responsibility to ensure timely payment of maintenance fees when due.

PTOL-85 (Rev. 08/07) Approved for use through 08/31/2010.

PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL

Complete and send this form, together with applicable fee(s), to: <u>Mail</u> Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
<u>or Fax</u> (571)-273-2885

CURRENT CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS (Note: Use Block 1 for any change of address)

5073   7590   03/19/2008

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

Note: A certificate of mailing can only be used for domestic mailings of the Fee(s) Transmittal. This certificate cannot be used for any other accompanying papers. Each additional paper, such as an assignment or formal drawing, must have its own certificate of mailing or transmission.

Certificate of Mailing or Transmission
I hereby certify that this Fee(s) Transmittal is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop ISSUE FEE address above, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571) 273-2885, on the date indicated below.

_____ (Depositor's name)

_____ (Signature)

_____ (Date)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,726	10/15/2003	Craig H. Rowland	062891.1166	5392

TITLE OF INVENTION: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR REDUCING THE FALSE ALARM RATE OF NETWORK INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEMS

APPLN. TYPE	SMALL ENTITY	ISSUE FEE DUE	PUBLICATION FEE DUE	PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE	TOTAL FEE(S) DUE	DATE DUE
nonprovisional	NO	$1440	$300	$0	$1740	06/19/2008

EXAMINER	ART UNIT	CLASS-SUBCLASS
MOORTHY, ARAVIND K	2131	726-025000

1. Change of correspondence address or indication of "Fee Address" (37 CFR 1.363).

☐ Change of correspondence address (or Change of Correspondence Address form PTO/SB/122) attached.

☐ "Fee Address" indication (or "Fee Address" Indication form PTO/SB/47; Rev 03-02 or more recent) attached. **Use of a Customer Number is required.**

2. For printing on the patent front page, list

(1) the names of up to 3 registered patent attorneys or agents OR, alternatively,   1 _____

(2) the name of a single firm (having as a member a registered attorney or agent) and the names of up to 2 registered patent attorneys or agents. If no name is listed, no name will be printed.   2 _____

3 _____

3. ASSIGNEE NAME AND RESIDENCE DATA TO BE PRINTED ON THE PATENT (print or type)

PLEASE NOTE: Unless an assignee is identified below, no assignee data will appear on the patent. If an assignee is identified below, the document has been filed for recordation as set forth in 37 CFR 3.11. Completion of this form is NOT a substitute for filing an assignment.

(A) NAME OF ASSIGNEE

(B) RESIDENCE: (CITY and STATE OR COUNTRY)

Please check the appropriate assignee category or categories (will not be printed on the patent) : ☐ Individual ☐ Corporation or other private group entity ☐ Government

4a. The following fee(s) are submitted:
☐ Issue Fee
☐ Publication Fee (No small entity discount permitted)
☐ Advance Order - # of Copies _____

4b. Payment of Fee(s): (Please first reapply any previously paid issue fee shown above)
☐ A check is enclosed.
☐ Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.
☐ The Director is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s), any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number _____ (enclose an extra copy of this form).

5. Change in Entity Status (from status indicated above)
☐ a. Applicant claims SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27.
☐ b. Applicant is no longer claiming SMALL ENTITY status. See 37 CFR 1.27(g)(2).

NOTE: The Issue Fee and Publication Fee (if required) will not be accepted from anyone other than the applicant; a registered attorney or agent; or the assignee or other party in interest as shown by the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Authorized Signature _____   Date _____

Typed or printed name _____   Registration No. _____

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,726	10/15/2003	Craig H. Rowland	062891.1166	5392

5073   7590   03/19/2008

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2001 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 600
DALLAS, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER
MOORTHY, ARAVIND K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 03/19/2008

Determination of Patent Term Adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154 (b)
(application filed on or after May 29, 2000)

The Patent Term Adjustment to date is 756 day(s). If the issue fee is paid on the date that is three months after the mailing date of this notice and the patent issues on the Tuesday before the date that is 28 weeks (six and a half months) after the mailing date of this notice, the Patent Term Adjustment will be 756 day(s).

If a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) was filed in the above-identified application, the filing date that determines Patent Term Adjustment is the filing date of the most recent CPA.

Applicant will be able to obtain more detailed information by accessing the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) WEB site (http://pair.uspto.gov).

Any questions regarding the Patent Term Extension or Adjustment determination should be directed to the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (571)-272-7702. Questions relating to issue and publication fee payments should be directed to the Customer Service Center of the Office of Patent Publication at 1-(888)-786-0101 or (571)-272-4200.

PTOL-85 (Rev. 08/07) Approved for use through 08/31/2010.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Notice of Allowability	10/685,726	ROWLAND, CRAIG H.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Aravind K. Moorthy	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to <u>5 December 2007</u>.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are <u>1-21</u>.

3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

        a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some*   c) ☐ None of the:

            1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

            2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

            3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * Certified copies not received: _____ .

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.

    (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached

        1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

    Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3. ☐ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____

4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ .

7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment

8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

9. ☐ Other _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 5 December 2007.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

3. Claims 1-21 have been allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 1-21 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The current application is directed towards a computerized method for reducing the false alarm rate of network intrusion detection systems includes receiving, from a network intrusion detection sensor, one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host and identifying characteristics of the alarm from the data packets. The characteristics include at least an attack type and an operating system fingerprint of the target host. The method further includes identifying the operating system type from the operating system fingerprint, comparing the attack type to the operating system type, and indicating whether the target host is vulnerable to the attack based on the comparison.

The closest prior art to the current application is McClure et al U.S. Patent No. 7,152,105 B2 (hereinafter McClure). McClure is directed towards a system and method provide comprehensive and highly automated testing of vulnerabilities to intrusion on a target network, including identification of operating system, identification of target network topology and target computers, identification of open target ports, assessment of vulnerabilities on target ports, active assessment of vulnerabilities based on information acquired from target computers, quantitative assessment of target network security and vulnerability, and hierarchical graphical representation

of the target network, target computers, and vulnerabilities in a test report. The system and method employ minimally obtrusive techniques to avoid interference with or damage to the target network during or after testing.

However, there are differences between McClure and the current application. For example, McClure fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "receiving, from a network intrusion detection sensor, one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host". McClure discloses that in order to "force" a response from the target computer, an intruder may send a malformed packet to a target port. While this known technique increases the likelihood that an open UDP port on the target computer can be identified, this technique also substantially increases the likelihood that the malformed packet could damage the target computer. Also, firewalls or routers may detect and filter out malformed packets, and such packets can alert the target network of an attempted security breach. The intelligent UDP port scanning test in accordance with this embodiment of the present invention employs an efficient, less intrusive and more accurate method for scanning UDP ports on a target computer (McClure at 24:11-26). This passage relates to a technique for discovering host computers (live target computers), particularly to a technique for applying an Intelligent UDP Port Scanning test to each IP address on a scan list (McClure at 22:31-38, 23:54, and 24:21-27). McClure discloses packets used to identify an operating system (McClure at 17:3618:3; see also McClure at 18:43-44). McClure fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "receiving, from a network intrusion detection sensor, one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host". McClure discloses that the packets are RFC-compliant TCP packets (McClure at 14:41-56; see also McClure at

16:57-17:4). The RFC-compliant TCP packets, however, are not the malformed packets. The use of RFC-compliant TCP packets advantageously reduces the probability that the detection packets are blocked by a router or firewall, and greatly reduces the probability that the detection packets will cause damage or crashes at the target computer (McClure at 16:62-67). That is, the packets greatly reduce the problems associated with the malformed packets. As a result, McClure fails to disclose "receiving, from a network intrusion detection sensor, one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host". McClure discloses that in the decision step 730, the process determines whether all the live target computers have been processed in TCP full connect scanning or whether all the batches of live target computers have been processed in TCP SYN scanning. If all the target computers or all the batches of target computers have been processed, the process ends. Otherwise, the process proceeds to a TCP service scan routine 740 wherein the process uses a TCP service discovery list 742 to identify the TCP service ports to be examined for each target computer. As described above, TCP packets are sent to the identified TCP service ports of each target computer, and the target computer vulnerability database 714 is updated for each target computer in accordance with whether a response is received or is not received from each target computer for each TCP service port scanned and using the known vulnerability database to obtain the vulnerability information for the particular TCP service ports that are determined to be open (McClure at 31:19-36). This passage of McClure also fails to disclose "receiving, from a network intrusion detection sensor, one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host". McClure does not disclose, teach or suggest receiving any message from a network intrusion detection sensor,

let alone receiving "one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host". McClure discloses that "TCP packets are sent to the identified TCP service ports [identified using TCP discovery list 742] of each target computer, and the target computer vulnerability database 714 is updated for each target computer in accordance with whether a response is received or is not received from each target computer for each TCP service port scanned and using the known vulnerability database to obtain the vulnerability information for the particular TCP service ports that are determined to be open" (McClure at 31:28-36). Updating a target computer vulnerability database or using a known vulnerability database, as discussed above, does not disclose, teach, or suggest receiving anything from a network intrusion detection system, let alone receiving from such a network intrusion detection system one or more data packets associated with an alarm indicative of a potential attack on a target host. As another example, McClure fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "identifying characteristics of the alarm from the data packets, including at least an attack type and an operating system fingerprint of the target host," "comparing the attack type to the operating system type" and "indicating whether the target host is vulnerable to the attack based on the comparison". For example, McClure discloses sending messages to a target computer and saving responses from the target computer as fingerprints (Id. at 17:29-64). The fingerprints are then compared to a known database of fingerprints associated with various operating systems and operating system versions (Id. at 17:65-68). According to McClure, known fingerprints can be compiled through application of the above methodology to various target computers known to have a particular operating system before testing (Id. at 17:67-18:3). The remainder of the portion discloses various additional details related to the

technique for identifying the operating system disclosed in McClure, including updating of the operating system fingerprint database, types of operating system fingerprints, and the types of messages that may be sent to the target computer to obtain responses from the target computer (Id. at 18:20-50).   However, McClure does not appear to disclose, teach, or suggest "identifying characteristics of the alarm from the data packets, including at least an attack type and an operating system fingerprint of the target host," "comparing the attack type to the operating system type" and "indicating whether the target host is vulnerable to the attack based on the comparison".

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee.   Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aravind K. Moorthy whose telephone number is 571-272-3793. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00-5:30.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aravind K Moorthy/
Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2132